

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
June 11, 2002**

Interest Group Committee:

Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Foundation
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	SD Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
David Nilson	NCCE&LSA
David Younkman	NWF
Dave Shibley	
Fred Schnaubelt	
Jeanne Pagett	
Mary Allison	USDRIC

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Bob Goralka (DPW)

Non-Agenda Item: Proxy Votes –

- Gendron to Chase; Messer to Silver; Bruvold to Whalen (first half of meeting); and Johnson to Stepmeyer.

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for May 28, 2002.
 - Bowlby had reiterated his concerns over revisions he had asked to be made to the April 30th minutes. He felt his comments were not reflected correctly in the May 14th minutes when he had first mentioned this issue. He felt the discussion regarding 40 acre lot sizes east of the CWA line should have been noted, as well as, the conversation between Adams and Silver regarding MSCP (as recorded).
 - On April 30th, Bowlby had asked Pryor why the county was pursuing 40 ac lot sizes on the east side of the CWA line when this interest group had signed off on 80s and 160s, which would solve the problem that the County has been faced with in regards to the lawsuit brought forth by SOFAR. Pryor responded that what was submitted to the court does not undermine this process. Whatever finally comes out of this process will be the new plan, not the ag20 lawsuit.
 - [Silver was proposing language for Conservation, policy H] Adams had asked how this policy would work in conjunction with MSCP, the one now on the ground in the county and future ones. Harron had responded that it would be consistent. Adams stated that he sees it as MSCP areas where you cannot go and the remaining areas where you have to follow strict interpretation as regulatory. Silver stated he believed Adams was proposing that we divide the county into two things – MSCP, which is a political negotiation with wildlife agencies that preserves identifiable population species, and *everything else* for development. He stated that he did not think that is what this is about. The MSCP is a mitigation with certainty. It has very good purposes but it is not a policy and is not for the entire county. Scarborough had asked Silver what his response was to Harron, who had said the way to accomplish this goal is through the MSCP. Silver responded that it is one of the ways but not the sole way.
 - No motion made. Scarborough chose to move the meeting forward.

Agenda Item II: Draft Revisions to the Goals & Policies –

- a) Open Space
 - Goal**
 - **Motion:** Silver moved to approve staff's recommendation: *An environment with open space for conservation, recreation and education.* Whalen seconded the motion. **Vote:** 10 – 0 – 2
 - Policy A**
 - **Motion:** Chase moved to approve the original language. Bowlby seconded the motion.
 - Silver stated that he wanted to move towards language that was similar to the original language as some landscapes that need protecting are not unique (proposed in staff's recommendation).
 - Stedt was uncomfortable with either choice and wanted to see the policy tied in with habitat conservation planning. He requested to amend the motion to *Open space and landscapes consistent with habitat conservation planning.* Whalen stated that this was redundant with Conservation, policy E. Pryor responded that redundancy is not encouraged.
 - Barker stated that the conservation goals are about conserving lots of things and not just open space (i.e. energy). However, open space is not only for conservation but recreation, etc. Suggested keeping policy A as one that address visual in order to make it a one thought policy, replacing *landscapes of unique visual character* with *scenic landscapes.*
 - Silver did not think habitat planning belonged here and reiterated that it has been addressed in another policy. Suggested *intact and/or scenic landscapes should be preserved.*
 - **Amendment:** Chase amended the motion to *Scenic landscapes should be preserved.* Bowlby withdrew his second to the motion. Doyle seconded the motion. **Vote:** 14 – 1 – 0

Policy B

- **Motion:** Whalen moved to delete the language due to redundancy with Conservation, policy E. Larson seconded the motion.
- **Amendment:** Pryde suggested adding *and connecting corridors* to Conservation, policy E if this policy is to be deleted.
- Chase supported the addition to Conservation, policy E. Had an issue with the linkage of open space that is not habitat and thus, did not like staff's recommendation.
- Stedt mentioned that he was in favor of deleting this policy and amending Conservation, policy E.
- Lambron stated that he supported the motion to delete as his impression of reading the language is one that would require more open space to be provided for MSCP.
- Pryde suggested *Open space linking significant habitats , trails, and buffer areas should be maintained as connecting corridors.*
- Adams supported deleting the policy as it appeared to go above and beyond the environmental protection of MSCP. He asked what the difference was between this policy and Conservation, policy E. Scarborough reiterated that the group is to think of human landscapes and needs rather than just wildlife.
- Larson stated that the visual, human, and habitat are clearly covered in other policies and reiterated his support to delete this policy.
- Barker reiterated that open space serves many different functions. Connections between open spaces are more fundamental because they expand the open space visually and provide connections for wildlife and habitat. Suggested *Open space connections to conserve natural resources and habitats, preserve community character, and provide trail linkages and visual connections.*
- Silver agreed that corridors should be put under Conservation, policy E. Thought this policy could be focused on trails and suggested *Connected open space for trails and community separation should be maintained.*
- Stedt stated that the issues the group is trying to address are already addressed in other policies. Unsure of community separation because not all communities want to be separated.
- Pryor stated that the group appears to be looking at open space in terms of function, mainly the human side since we have already addressed the preservation side for wildlife. Suggested *Open space areas, which serve as links between recreation and preservation areas, create community identity, or used for managed production should be preserved.*
- Whalen asked how MSCP in its adopted form does not do what we are trying to do here, for human use. Pryor replied that MSCP is an implementation strategy and not the general plan for the county. It basically says how we are going to preserve some habitat for an area and what this group is trying to do, is set the goals for the general plan, which deals across the board for a lot of activities. Carmichael responded that 4S Ranch is an example of where MSCP did not accomplish its function. 4S Ranch has hardline MSCP areas, yet through the central area of artesian creek, there is still the trail connection made and open space buffer for the creek that is not part of MSCP.
- Silver suggested having a policy *Open space areas which support trails or community identity should be preserved*, in addition with deleting policy B and adding *connections* to Conservation, policy E.
- Doyle suggested *Ensure the linkage of open space for recreational purposes, community identity, or managed production.*
- Tabb stated that open space to create community identity is a non sequiter. Also had issues with managed production because he believes ag land is the only area left for homes and does not want to sacrifice homes for open space.
- Bowlby stated his reason for opposing some of these goals and policies is because he feels that we are weakening the policies.
- Whalen suggested *Within the context of regional open space and habitat conservation planning...* to include those human uses that are not included as MSCP. Chase asked what if there is no MSCP thus, having no context. Whalen suggested *In the absence of a regional open space and habitat conservation planning, connected open space for trails and community separation should be maintained.*
- Coombs proposed to not delete policy B and instead, add the language in the new policy (E).
- **Vote:** Delete Open Space, policy B and add *and connecting corridors* to Cons., policy E: 11 – 5 – 0

Policies C, D, and new policy (E)

- **Motion:** Whalen moved to approve language as proposed. Chase seconded the motion.
- Doyle thought the new policy (E) should be broadened because we are not just talking about a regional trail network. Larson suggested adding another policy rather than altering the new policy.
- **Vote:** 16 – 0 – 1

New Policy

- **Motion:** Doyle moved *Ensure the linkage of open space for recreational uses, community identity purposes, or managed production.*
- Barker asked why the development community would not want to ensure open space is included if that is the reason why people buy million dollar homes in East County. Higgins responded that you cannot ensure it is going to happen.
- Larson stated that if agriculture is going to be lumped into “managed production”, ag is covered in other policies and linkages from an agricultural standpoint is not desirable.
- Silver suggested amending the language to *should be preserved.*
- **Amendment:** Chase stated she supports changing *identity* to *separation*, removing *managed production*, and adding *should be preserved.* Chase asked Pryor if linking managed productions was important. Pryor responded that it is where you have mineral extractions, resources, etc. Stedt stated that he opposed omitting the language from the policy.
- **Vote:** *Linkages of open space for recreational uses and community separation purposes should be preserved:* 10 – 4 – 3

b) Circulation

Circulation Goal

- **Motion:** Chase moved Barker/staff’s proposal *A multi-modal circulation system that provides for the safe, accessible convenient and efficient movement of people and goods.* Whalen seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy A

- **Motion:** Chase moved a combination of Vance’s and her own language, *Ensure timely provision of fair share contributions for adequate regional and local circulation system capacity in response to planned growth.* Whalen seconded the motion.
- Higgins was concerned with the term *regional* because the cost to the county is not practical.
- **Amendment:** Chase amended the motion to *Ensure timely provision of adequate local circulation system capacity in response to planned growth.* **Vote:** 17 – 0 – 1

Policy B

- **Motion:** Chase moved her language *Establish land use and transportation network patterns that will reduce single-occupant automobile trips, encourage the use of public transit and alternative modes of travel, and encourage pedestrian-oriented development.* Whalen seconded the motion.
- **Amendment:** Higgins commented the language *that will reduce* implies a mandate for someone to get out of the car. She suggested *that can or should help reduce*, etc. Motion changed to *will help.* **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy C and D

- **Motion:** Silver moved Barker/staff’s proposals, *Coordinate the location and design of the circulation system to serve existing and new employment centers and residential communities* and *Locate and design the circulation system to minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods, environmentally sensitive areas and scenic areas.* Whalen seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

New Policies – General (AA and BB)

- Stedt asked why staff did not support Chase’s language. Pryor responded that it referred to design standards and secondly, one cannot do it.
- Silver thought something should be done with the latter proposal (BB), stating that schools should be sited in centers of communities.
- Stepner stated that legally, state planning and zoning laws require other agencies to have their public improvements to at least conform to the general plan. He mentioned that the City of San Diego’s City of Villages has a number of pages that discuss site designs for schools.
- **Motion:** Chase moved to approve *Site and design schools to allow and encourage students to walk and bicycle to school safely.* **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy E and F

- **Motion:** Tabb moved to approve Barker/staff's proposal, *Establish multi-modal public transit centers in existing and planned higher density areas and Support and encourage the use of public transit and car/van pools to reduce roadway congestion, conserve energy and reduce pollution.* Doyle seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

New Policies – Public Transit (CC, DD, and EE)

- Scarborough asked why staff did not support this policy. Goralka had responded that this would be a specific design measure regarding intersections and thus, really specific and would be best to not be in the general plan. Pryor stated that it would be appropriate to have a motion to refer this over to DPW for consideration into the design road standards.
- **Motion:** Doyle moved to refer the first new policy under General (AA) and the three new policies under Public Transit (CC, DD, and EE) to DPW for consideration.
- **Amendment:** Chase requested to add another policy with regards to addressing the fire department's equipment issues. Feels the greatest effort should be made to design or buy equipment to fit the road and not let the equipment drive the road standards. Amendment accepted.
- **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy G

- **Motion:** Chase did not think this policy belonged in the general plan. She moved to delete. Stedt seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy H

- **Motion:** Chase moved to approve her language, *Provide safe and attractive accommodation for all users of the roadway, including transit riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians.* Doyle seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

Policy I

- **Motion:** Doyle moved to delete due to redundancy. Stedt seconded the motion. **Vote:** 18 – 0 – 0

New Policy (Roads)

- Chase withdrew her proposal.

New Policy

- **Motion:** Chase had pulled a policy from a handout given out at a previous meeting from Brent McDonald (Caltrans). She moved to approve a new policy, *Establish transit-oriented development zoning, guidelines, and incentives to encourage appropriate land uses and improvements around future transit centers to promote safe pedestrian circulation and to facilitate and encourage transit ridership* (City of Peoria, AZ – Circulation Policies B-7b&d, slightly modified). Bowlby seconded the motion.
- **Amendment:** Stedt wanted the policy to be more succinct because he felt it was too complicated. Chase proposed *Establish transit-oriented development zoning, guidelines and incentives.*
- **Amendment:** Harron and Pryor responded that the zoning ordinance will be updated and this can be referred to that. Chase proposed to remove *zoning*.
- **Vote:** *Establish transit-oriented development guidelines and incentives:* 18 – 0 – 0

Trails Policy (Proposed to be Moved to PFE)

- Barker clarified that she had added this policy to her proposal because she thought bicycle trails were supposed to be part of Circulation and staff had recommended it be moved to the Public Facilities element.
- Adams stated he was opposed to the policy because he had specifically asked if trails were going to be an additional land use designation, thus shrinking the amount of land available for housing development, in which he was told that that was not our intention. Feels this clearly states that intention and would be an additional factor.
- Holler mentioned that trails have been addressed under Circulation and Open Space.
- **Motion:** Scarborough clarified that Chase was proposing to replace the existing policies B through E under Circulation. Stedt preferred to retain the existing policies B through E over those that

Barker had proposed. He moved to retain Circulation, policies B through E as voted on March 19, 2002.

- Barker withdrew her proposal.
- Chase proposed to add *establish* at the beginning of policy D.
- Coombs proposed to add *a County trails system* to the end of policy D. Stedt disagreed stating that it should remain on a voluntary basis rather than be a mandate.
- Goralka mentioned that the Trails Master Plan has been proposed to be brought forward and that system itself will become part of the general plan. This is something to take into account as you come up with these general policies as it there will be at some point in the general plan, a Trails Master Plan adopted at the General Plan level.
- **Amendment:** Scarborough asked Stedt if he would support the change from *trails* to *a County trails system* on policy D if the language remained as is. Stedt agreed.
- Bowlby stated he was against the motion because he thinks that we need to establish a County trails system to help the circulatory system.
- Pryde stated he would be willing to support the motion if he is able to propose a follow-up motion.
- **Vote:** 15 – 0 – 1

New Policy

- **Motion:** Pryde moved *Establish a County trails system*. **Vote:** 10 – 0 – 5

c) Safety

Policy B and C

- Coombs stated that she did not feel staff's recommendation was strong enough. Carmichael responded that the state has designated the entire county to be in a high fire hazard area. Coombs asked whether the county could prioritize what is high or mid, etc. Carmichael responded that areas can be prioritized by seasonal or volunteer services so we try to limit development in limited service areas.
- Adams stated he did not support staff's 2nd recommendation to policy B.
- Chase stated that she did not support staff's recommendation because they have already been addressed, especially with regards to policy C.
- **Motion:** Adams moved to strike policies B, C, and E, stating that the development community already has to adhere to strict guidelines under water quality. Chase seconded the motion.
- Silver disagreed because there are obviously areas where people put themselves at very high risks and ask everyone else to subsidize their wealthy lifestyles. Rejects the notion that we cannot make a distinction between the middle of a country town, the middle of the suburbs and ranchettes in the middle of chaparral. Stated that he preferred the original language under policy B.
- Adams withdrew policy E from the motion to further the discussion.
- **Vote:** Delete Policy C: 18 – 0 – 0
- **Vote:** Delete Policy B: 12 – 0 – 6

New Policy

- **Motion:** Bowlby moved *Development in areas with high fire hazards should be appropriately limited*.
- **Vote:** 8 – 8 – 2, motion fails.

Agenda Item III: Process- Status and Next Steps

- Silver was concerned that the group was rushing through the last few policies by voting to delete all the fire safety policies and proposed resuming revisions to the Goals & Policies at the next meeting.
- Scarborough mentioned that the meeting scheduled for June 25th has been cancelled. Next meeting will be July 9th.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments

- David Nilson had asked if the equity mechanisms were in progress. Holler responded that he has a meeting set up with Rick Pruetz and that we will be working off of letter from him. Also, a sub-committee has been created.